

Subject: Re: Alaska Peninsula Highway

Date: Fri, 15 Mar 2002 10:33:07 -0900

From: Eric Taylor <eric_taylor@dot.state.ak.us>

Organization: State of Alaska

To: "Ekstrom, Robert" <EkstromR@alyeska-pipeline.com>

CC: 'Fred Matsuno' <matsuno.fred@epa.gov>, 'Roy Matsuno' <ugashik@gci.net>,

"Ottesen, Jeff" <Jeff_Ottesen@dot.state.ak.us>,

Jack D Melton <jack_melton@dot.state.ak.us>

Robert:

Thank you for your comment. For clarification, when you refer to "highland route" do you mean an east-west route from Ugashik to Wide Bay? And "lowland route" as the route from Ugashik to Port Heiden as presented in the draft Southwest Transportation Plan? I'm confused by your use of the terms "Southwest Transportation Plan" and "latter plan."

I took a look at the old "spaghetti map." It showed a resource route from King Salmon that bypassed Egegik to the east, then crossed to the east side of the Peninsula on both the north and south sides of Becharof Lake. It then proceeded southwest along Wide Bay, crossing the range again north of Mt Chiginagak, then proceeding to Port Heiden. The route avoids Ugashik and Pilot Point by a wide margin. It was not designed to connect communities (unless communities move to it, or spring up along it), but rather to access known or potential mineral deposits. Much of the potentially exploitable mineral sites are now tied up in federal conservation system units as a result of ANILCA, somewhat trumping the whole justifying premise for those "spaghetti" routes.

I also looked at the historic use (RS 2477) route map, which shows a route from Egegik running southeasterly, south of Becharof Lake to Portage Bay at the Kanatak site. Most of this route, including the port site, is within the Becharof National Wildlife Refuge. The port site falls under the Kodiak Island Borough boundary. This route likewise has no connection to Ugashik.

We agree that the specifics of the particular Alaska Peninsula Highway (APH) corridor alignment in the draft plan can be improved upon (i.e., highland terrain vs. lowlands). However that is the task of a more detailed route study which would likely occur when a subsequent plan deems such investigation appropriate. At this stage such details are of negligible consequence. The primary purpose for listing the APH corridors in the Southwest Transportation Plan has been to document the need for connecting the communities (as expressed by the plan advisory committee). I personally think that this is the key point that community leaders need to keep making well after the ink is dry on the plan. Fragmenting the collective need identified during planning into individual community self-interest will lead to further legislative inaction and no improvement for anyone. The plan is a beginning, not an ending. A lot of work remains to be done to bring any of it to reality.

While we did not intend for the plan to be used to dismiss claims to historic and traditional use corridors, we see how that could be a possible interpretation of omitting those routes in the plan itself. Therefore we will include an appropriate clause in the final plan to clarify that a continued state interest in them remains.

Warm regards,
Eric Taylor

"Ekstrom, Robert" wrote:

> Eric,
> I looked over the DOT Southwest Transportation Plan. I would like to give
> my opinion of this proposed highway plan.
>
> This plan has all the practical and financial elements needed when
> considering one route over another. In particular, the Southwest

> Transportation Plan has much less impact on the wildlife and environment.
> This Plan has an appreciative reduction of the stream crossings over the
> other plan, i.e. the route that would run through the lowlands of the
> peninsula. This latter plan (lowland route) passes through a corridor of
> wetlands, waterfowl nesting areas, spawning streams, and caribou migration
> routes. If you compare the costs of both routes, building and maintaining
> the necessary infrastructure in my mind would be much less on the highland
> route (Southwest Transportation Plan). Looking at Southwest Transportation
> Plan a couple possible cost savings occur to me, it would require less
> bridges and has easier access to gravel sources for road bedding. Southwest
> Transportation Plan also offers the State better access to the Alaska
> Peninsula. An additional advantage to the State and the Alaska Peninsula is
> the acquisition a potential deep-water port via Wide Bay.

>
> Thank You,
> Ugashik Traditional Village
> Robert J. Ekstrom
> Tribal Council Secretary
> Office: 357-4008
> Cell: 831-0728
> Office e-mail: ekstrom@mtaonline.net

>
> "Organize Your Life Around Your Dreams And Watch Them Come True."
> "You Must Keep the Faith of a Child"

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Roy Matsuno [<mailto:ugashik@gci.net>]
> Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2002 2:26 PM
> To: Greg Kingsley
> Cc: Hattie Caroline Albecker
> Subject: road to wide bay

>
> I attended the DOT Southwest Transportation Plan meeting last night
> here in Anchorage and would like to see the road from Ugashik to Wide Bay
> added onto the list of corridors.

> We had the road from Ugashik to Port Heiden on the list as part of
> the Alaska Peninsula Highway, but I feel that it is too expensive and we
> would have to build bridges across the Dog Salmon and King Salmon River as
> well as the many creeks between King Salmon and Port Heiden. The road to
> Wide Bay would be on higher ground and would provide access to a deep water
> port at Wide Bay. I didn't even think about having access to freighters from
> Seattle, rather than shipping from Anchorage, but we would be able to do
> that. I talked to Bobby Jo Kramer and she supports the corridor and am
> emailing this to Shirley Kelly also. Please email your comments to Eric
> Taylor at eric_taylor@dot.state.ak.us <mailto:eric_taylor@dot.state.ak.us>
> and you can look at the plan at <<http://www.dot.state.ak.us>>, click on the
> Southwest Plan.

> Roy